	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/520,404	MARTINEK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher A. Revak	2131
All Participants:	Status of Application: RC	<u>:E</u>
(1) Christopher A. Revak.	(3)	
(2) Roger Sampson.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 18 August 2005	Time: <u>3:00pm</u>	
Type of Interview:  Telephonic Video Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative) o	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:  Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sep directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sep did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief separate in the necessary for applicant to provide a sep did not result in resolution of all issues.</li> </ul>	on. The examiner will provide a writted	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
	·	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Ap	oplicant/Applicant's Representative Si	anaturo if appropriato)
(AL	phicampythicant a Mehresentative 21	gnature – ii appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted the applicant's representative to correct dependent claims 4 and 5 and depended on a cancelled claim. The applicant's representative gave the examiner permission to correct the claims via an examiner's amendment. The examiner also indicated that a cited reference on the PTO-1449 was missing and that if the applicant wished to have that reference considered, to please provide it and at that time, the examiner would consider the reference..